

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 11-17 and 19-24 are pending in the current application. Claims 1, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 are independent claims. Claims 3, 9, 10 and 18 have been cancelled. Independent claims 23 and 24 have been added. Favorable reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**NEW INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 23 AND 24**

By the present Amendment, independent claims 23 and 24 have been added. Independent claims 23 and 24 recite (*albeit*, in different formats) “at least one of the second conductors extends across a different edge of the second semiconductor chip than the first conductors.” Support for claims 23 and 24 may be found at least in FIGs. 3 and 4 of the originally filed disclosure. As such, no new matter has been added.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(e) REJECTION – MESS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-17, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mess et al. (hereinafter ‘Mess’), U.S. Patent No. 6,900,528. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 16 and 21 have been amended (*albeit*, in different formats) to recite a redistribution pattern connecting or redistributing “the first plurality of bond pads on the second semiconductor chip to a second plurality of bond pads on the second semiconductor chip, the second plurality of bond pads arranged adjacent to a different edge of the second semiconductor chip.” Non-limiting, example embodiments may be found throughout the disclosure. Applicant directs the Examiner’s attention, for example, to FIGs. 1 and 4.

Applicant submits that Mess, as relied upon by the Examiner, fails to anticipate or suggest the above-mentioned limitations of independent claims 1, 16 and 21.

### Mess

The Examiner asserts that Mess teaches "...a redistribution pattern 62 electrically connecting the first plurality of bond pads 54A on the second semiconductor chip to a second plurality of bond pads 54B on the second semiconductor chip..." Action, p. 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

FIG. 13 of Mess (reproduced below) shows the bond pad 54A connecting the lower die 60A with the upper die 60B. Thus, the bond pad 54A is on the lower chip 60A, not on the upper chip 60B (as suggested by the Examiner).




FIG. 13 of MESS

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Mess fails to anticipate or suggest "a redistribution pattern electrically connecting the first plurality of bond pads on the second semiconductor chip to a second plurality of bond pads on the second semiconductor chip, the second plurality of bond pads arranged adjacent to a different edge of the second

semiconductor chip” as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 16, and similarly recited in independent claim 21.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection to independent claims 1, 16 and 21. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 2, 4-8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17 and 19, at least by virtue of their dependency on amended independent claim 1 or 16, is kindly requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION – MESS AND KATO

Claims 13, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mess in view of Kato et al. (hereinafter ‘Kato’), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0140107 A1. Applicant traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, Mess fails to suggest all the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Upon review of Kato, Applicant submits that Kato provides no teaching that suggests “a redistribution pattern electrically connecting the first plurality of bond pads on the second semiconductor chip to a second plurality of bond pads on the second semiconductor chip, the second plurality of bond pads arranged adjacent to a different edge of the second semiconductor chip” as recited in amended independent claim 1. See Figures 1-35 of Kato. Thus, Applicant submits that Kato fails to remedy the deficiencies of Mess with respect to amended independent claim 1.

Thus, Applicant submit that claims 13 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency on amended independent claim 1, as well as for its own merits.

Furthermore, independent claim 20 has been amended to include a similar feature as recited in independent claims 1, 16 and 21. In particular, independent claim 20 has been amended to recite “a redistribution pattern redistributing a first plurality of bond pads on the upper semiconductor chip to a second plurality of bond pads positioned on a different edge of

the upper semiconductor chip.” Thus, amended independent claim 20 is allowable over the combination of Mess and Kato for similar reasons given above.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Mess in view of Kato fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in amended independent claim 20.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to amended independent claim 20 is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

JAC/CDW:psy